



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Jemark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FLING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
--------------------	------------	-----------------------	------------------

-09/240,524 01/29/99 GERNDT

R KCC-14-026

EXAMINER

QM02/1006  
PAULEY PETERSEN KINNE & FEJER  
2800 WEST HIGGINS ROAD  
SUITE 365  
HOFFMAN ESTATES IL 60195

ATKANON, C PAPER NUMBER

3743  
DATE MAILED:

10/06/99

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

### OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
 This action is FINAL.  
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

#### Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 Claim(s) 1-25 is/are allowed.  
 Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.  
 Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
are subject to restriction or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.  
 The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.  
 The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.  
 The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).  
 All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
 received.  
 received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 4  
 received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

- Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892  
 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4  
 Interview Summary, PTO-413  
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  
 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

-SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES-

Art Unit: 3743

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 8, 14, 18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Richards.

The patent of Richards in Figures 1-3 discloses the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 3743

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 4, 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Richards in view of Smith, Jr. The patent of Richards discloses all the claimed features of the invention with the exception of baffles.

The patent of Smith, Jr. in Figures 1-6 discloses baffles defining fluid flow channels for the purpose of reducing flow resistance. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Richards baffles defining the fluid flow channels for the purpose of reducing flow resistance as disclosed in Smith, Jr.

Claims 5-7, 10-12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Richards. The patent of Richards discloses all the claimed features of the invention with the exception of the claimed number of channels. The claimed number of channels is considered to be an obvious design choice which does not solve any stated problem or produce any new and/or unexpected result.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Richards in view of Eriksen et al. The patent of Richards discloses all the claimed features of the invention with the exception of a spiral channel.

The patent of Eriksen et al. in Figure 5 discloses a spiral fluid flow channel for the purpose of reducing flow resistance. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

Art Unit: 3743

person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Richards a spiral fluid flow channel for the purpose of reducing flow resistance as disclosed in Eriksen et al.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Atkinson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2603.

*Christopher Atkinson*

C.A.

October 1, 1999

CHRISTOPHER ATKINSON

PATENT EXAMINER